Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply Search this topic… 731 posts 1 … 8 9 10 11 12 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm
> > Daniel..nonexistent exists as an idea.
>
> Correct. And a word or term.
>
> Yet *more* evidence for existence, not nonexistence.

So, you AGREE that 'nonexistence' exists, in some form and way, YET also STILL want to 'try to' CLAIM that 'nonexistence' actually does NOT exist.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm
> > Those who existed who have died are evidence of nonexistence.
>
> Those who *lived*, not existed. They still exist as concepts, as memories. Additionally upon their physical death no gap of nonexistence was introduced. Things just more or less shifted around.
>
> It is not evidence of nonexistence. It is evidence of the life cycle, that living organisms are mortal and eventually break down. Their lives, their deaths, their memories. All things, all processes, all evidence of existence, not nonexistence.
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm
> > Those who are born, who pop aware to exist eventually become nonexistent….in death.
>
> They existed previously just not necessarily in that form or consciously.
>
> Who, what are "those"? They are complex arrangements of matter and energy. That existed before consciousness. That exists after consciousness. In a sense they were never nonexistent. Things are never nonexistent. Things just change, move, they shift around.

Wow 'you' are SO CLOSE here "daniel j lavender", but STILL 'so far', as some might.

Although EVERY one in this forum, IS SO CLOSE, but STILL 'so far', as well.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> Things don't just pop into being from nothing. Something cannot come from nothing or nonexistence. Something cannot turn into nothing or nonexistence. Death is not nonexistence. Nonexistence is not and cannot be.

The EASE and SIMPLICITY that what is written here could ACTUALLY be EXPLAINED, and UNDERSTOOD, YET STILL appear SO FAR AWAY FROM the ACTUAL Truth of 'things' is Truly remarkable.

'This' goes for just about EVERY 'thing' that EVERY one who are 'TRYING TO' SAY, WRITE, and CLAIM 'things' here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> The dead are not nonexistent. They are dead.
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm
> > Both existence and nonexistence are ideas, that's all.
>
> *Nonexistence* is an idea, that's all. And a word or term.
>
> Existence is a word, a term, a concept which attempts to represent, to reference and describe what is. Words, language has limits, however, and can't do what is justice.

Does 'language', itself, REALLY have 'limits'?

Or, do 'you', human beings, USE 'language' in 'limited' or 'limiting' ways?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> All that is is existence, as you illustrate in your statement here. Even nonexistence, even nonexistent are things, are standing examples of existence. The ideas of nonexistence themselves can't help but reveal the truth.

So, if 'nonexistence' and 'nonexistent' can be 'things', then WHY can 'nothing' or 'no thing' NOT be a 'thing' as well, to you?

Surely, if some of the 'things', within concepts, can be 'things', then ALL of the 'things', within concepts, can be AS WELL, correct?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm
> > meaning both existence and nonexistence are one and the same phenomena, they just differ in appearance that's all.
>
> If there is something there is not nothing.

The CONTRADICTION, which you EXPRESSED BEFORE, you are AGAIN EXPRESSING here now.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> If there is existence there is not nonexistence.

But you just through TELLING us and CLAIMING that 'nonexistence', in some forms, IS an aspect of, or a PART OF, 'Existence', Itself.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> Nothingness, nonexistence is not hiding behind the curtain of existence. All that is is existence. Nonexistence isn't there.

OF COURSE these 'things' are NOT hiding behind the curtain of 'Existence'. For the VERY OBVIOUS REASON. HOWEVER, for there to even be 'Existence', Itself, 'nothingness' AND 'nonexistence' HAVE TO BE EXISTING IN 'Existence', and NOT 'above', 'beyond', 'beside', NOR 'behind' 'Existence'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> Existence and nonexistence cannot simultaneously be. Nonexistence is not and cannot be at all.

YET you just SAID that 'nonexistence' DOES ACTUALLY EXIST, as a 'word', a 'concept' AND as an 'idea'.

So, THE CONTRADICTION continues.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:13 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:11 pm
> >
> > > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:48 pm
> > >
> > > These are not the observer. These things are the observed.
> > >
> > > Where is the exact location of the observer?
> >
> > The location is myself, a conscious being, which is located in Tennessee, America, Earth, Milky Way, Existence.
>
> Yourself / myself must be everywhere at once then, to be located in all the places you've mentioned. In reality there is no known object observing itself,

BUT, IN Reality, if One 'Thing' is ABLE to SEE, COMPREHEND, KNOW, and UNDERSTAND ALL, then 'It' COULD, and MUST BE ABLE TO, SEE, or OBSERVE, 'ItSelf'.

Or, to you, is the ALL-KNOWING and ALL-SEEING One NOT even ABLE TO observe ALL and Everything, or thy Self?

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm
> as concepts know nothing of their existence.

So, the human concept of 'Oneness' KNOWS absolutely NOTHING of the existence of thy One, thee Self, Itself, correct?

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm
> America does not know of its existence it's an idea…and what is an idea? I've no idea.
>
> Nothing is everything and everything is nothing…..in this conception. . Albeit illusory.

Last edited by Age on Wed Jul 05, 2023 1:51 pm, edited 1 time in total.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:15 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:40 pm
>
> > Things are never nonexistent.
>
> No thing knows this because things have no awareness to know they exist or don't exist.Things are being awared , they are being looked upon, being observed…by awareness that can never experience itself as the thing it is aware of.

WHY does the one LITTLE human being known here as "dontaskme" BELIEVE that 'it' KNOWS MORE ABOUT 'Awareness', or 'Consciousness', Itself, than 'Awareness', or 'Consciousness', DOES?

Will 'you' ANSWER this QUESTION "dontaskme"?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:29 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:40 pm
> > **No thing** knows this because things have no awareness to know they exist or don't exist.
>
> I have awareness, I *am* awareness and know, or at the *very* least can confidently claim, that I exist.

BUT WHO and/or WHAT IS the 'I', EXACTLY?

Or, 'you' might be BETTER AWARE of the QUESTION, 'Who AM 'I'?

If one IS Truly AWARE, then that 'one' would ALREADY KNOW the proper AND correct ANSWER to 'this QUESTION'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> I am awareness. I am aware of awareness, I am aware of myself as awareness, I am aware of other things, I am aware of existence generally. I am a thing.

AND, how MANY of these 'I am aware', 'things' are there, EXACTLY, or roughly?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:09 pm
> > Both knowing and not knowing simultaneously…..a conceptual overlay upon the non conceptual. In the same context an image is an overlay upon a blank screen.
>
> If there is an image there is not a blank screen. If there is a blank screen there is not an image on the screen.
>
> They are not the same, they are not simultaneously. Just like existence and nonexistence. Existence and nonexistence are not the same, nor can they exist simultaneously.

Can human beings and polar bears exist simultaneously?

Can truth and human beings exist simultaneously?

Can images and blank screens exist simultaneously?

Can areas of material expanse and immaterial expanse exist simultaneously?

Can space and matter exist simultaneously?

If no, then WHY NOT?

But if yes, then WHY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> However both the blank screen and the image are things, they are parts of existence whether they exist simultaneously or not. In other words it is all existence. There is always existence.
>
> You try to convey evidence for nonexistence only to provide *more* evidence for existence.
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:09 pm
> > Nothing and everything are conjoined twins infinitely for eternity inseparably one.
>
> Something and nothing cannot coexist.

Here IS 'THAT BELIEF', which you are HOLDING ONTO, 'for dear life', as some might say, and WHY you are NOT YET READY NOR PREPARED for the ACTUAL Truth of 'things' here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> If there is something there is not nothing.

BUT, to you, BOTH 'the blank screen' AND 'the images' ARE 'things', which ARE PARTS OF 'Existence', whether 'they' EXIST SIMULTANEOUSLY, or NOT.

So, to you, SOME 'things' CAN EXIST, but NOT ALL 'things' CAN.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> If there are many things there is not nothing.

SO, if there are 'many things' in one PART OF the Universe, then there can NOT be 'nothing' in ANOTHER PART of the Universe, right?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:39 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> >
> > Something and nothing cannot coexist.
>
> Ok, lets try another way of putting this into words.
> Does not a blank empty screen and the moving pictures projected onto it not coexist together in conjunction with the knowing of these two concepts (empty and full) (no thing and some thing)?
>
> The empty blank screen and the projected images upon it both arise at the same time together as existence, one doesn't come first and the other follow after, they both exist as the same time, namely, here NOW
> Existence is BOTH the empty screen and the contents on it.
>
> Existence is both a duality and nonduality, simply because existence appears as both empty and full, as images of the imageless.
> Nonduality is duality, apparently, so it seems.
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> > If there is something there is not nothing.
>
> Some thing and no thing are still things. Some thing is known, and no thing is without concept. The thing without concept can be known conceptually and has to be already there in existence to be known. Existence is without concept. If the empty screen of no thing wasn't already here, no image on this screen could be known. This empty blank screen and it's contents are the conceptual overlay likened to a blank imageless movie screen (no thing) that is totally embedded behind every known image (some thing) Both no thing and something are the same one phenomena.
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> > If there are many things there is not nothing.
>
> But even no thing is a thing here as existence. In the same context, a no-nonbelief is still a belief.

I would have SAID, 'a 'disbelief' of some 'thing' IS STILL a 'belief', instead'.

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am
> We are dealing only with concepts, existence to be known can only be made of concepts, and that is only possible because existence already exists to become known conceptually, otherwise existence could not be conceptualised.
>
> No thing can be known.

Yes, 'it' is known as 'no thing' OR 'nothing', which ARE STILL 'words', 'ideas', 'concepts' AND 'things'.

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am
> But the known thing cannot know.

Can 'you', human beings, 'know' 'things'?

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am
> In the same context, there can be awareness without consciousness, but there cannot be consciousness without awareness.

HOW, and WHY?

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am
> There can be no consciousness without awareness, but there can be awareness without consciousness, as in deep sleep. Awareness is absolute, consciousness is relative to its content; consciousness is always of something. Consciousness is partial and changeful, awareness is total, changeless, calm and silent.

Could there be 'awareness' if there was ONLY 'nothing'?

If yes, then HOW, EXACTLY?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:51 am

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:28 am
> >
> > > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:48 pm
> > >
> > > These are not the observer. These things are the observed.
> > >
> > > Where is the exact location of the observer?
> >
> > At the One and ONLY 'Place' 'I' CAN BE, while USING the One and ONLY 'Thing' POSSIBLE to SEE ALL that 'I' CAN.
> >
> > If 'you' are STILL NOT YET AWARE OF WHERE 'this Place' IS and/or WHAT 'this Thing' IS, EXACTLY, then just let 'Me' KNOW.
>
> I the observer has no centre, it therefore, is everywhere at once, one without a second. Infinite.

'I' would have USED the 'Observer' word, INSTEAD, but 'you' are more than welcome to USE the 'observer' word, if 'you' prefer to.

Also, was there absolutely ANY 'thing' in absolutely ANYWHERE that I SAID and WROTE that SUGGESTED that the 'Observer' has A center?

If yes, then WHERE and WHAT, EXACTLY?

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am
> It cannot be located

YET here 'you' were TELLING us EXACTLY WHERE 'it' CAN BE, and IS, 'located'.

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am
> because there is nowhere for it to place itself as it has no beginning nor end to pin or place it to a specific point.

SO, WHY did 'you' TELL 'us' that 'it' IS EVERYWHERE, AT ONCE, if, SUPPOSEDLY and ALLEGEDLY, there IS ABSOLUTELY NOWHERE for 'it' to so-called 'place itself?

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am
> The I does not observe, the I is being observed by no I

So, YOUR first three words in YOUR response here SAY, 'I the observer'. However, now YOU CLAIM that 'I' ACTUALLY does NOT 'observe', so now we are left with there is NO 'I' and even NO 'observer', ANYWAY.

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am
> The I in finite apparently is finite...the I in finite is a finite appearance within the infinite.
>
> The I is being looked upon, the I is not the looker.

Here we have ANOTHER PRIME example of just how these people, back then, were ACTUALLY BELIEVING that the letter 'I' ACTUALLY referred to 'them', individually AND personally.

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am
> Both the no I and I are the same one phenomena, as both the looker and the looked upon are inseparably one and the same reality.

Okay, BUT BOTH NEITHER of 'them' and BOTH of 'them' could 'observe' AND could 'not observe', AT THE SAME TIME, right?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 1:53 pm
> > > Can you SHOW 'immaterial expanse'?
> > >
> > > if yes, then HOW, EXACTLY?
> >
> > It's apparent in the density variance of things. Air is less dense than quartz.
>
> But 'air' is a 'material thing', right?

Air is comprised of physical material, yes. But air is also comprised of immaterial expanse. Air is not as dense, air contains less matter than stone or other objects which contain more matter and less immaterial expanse.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> > Different objects, different regions of existence exhibit various densities due to various amounts of immaterial expanse.
>
> But 'objects' and 'regions of existence' are 'material things', right?

Certain things are considered material things, yes. Those things are largely comprised of matter or of physical material and are tangible or palpable.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> And, 'to have density' would be a 'material thing' right? Or, can 'immaterial expanse' have 'density' also?

Any object or region can be considered to have density.

Again it concerns the amount of physical material present, the amount of energy present and the amount of immaterial expanse present. Those things, including immaterial expanse, are components which determine density. That is density, that is what determines density variance. For any object, for any region.

Theoretically speaking perhaps a 100% completely solid, completely material object would have 100% density while a region of completely pure immaterial expanse would have 0% density.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> So, WHERE is the 'immaterial expanse', EXACTLY?

All around. Immaterial expanse is quite prevalent. Not ubiquitous but prevalent.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 1:53 pm
> > >
> > > Can 'concepts' have counterparts?
> >
> > Yes, concepts may have counterparts as they are parts of existence, concepts alone are not the entirety of existence.
>
> Great. So, the 'counterpart' of 'Existence', which is 'nonexistence', is a 'concept', which ACTUALLY does exist, IN 'Existence'.

The counterpart of the *concept* existence.

Yes. The concept, the term "nonexistence" is a concept. It exists. That would not be nonexistence or no thing. That is a term, a concept. A thing. Not no thing. Not nonexistence. Nonexistence is not and cannot be.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> > Parts can have counterparts. Hence the term counter*parts*.
> >
> > Existence in general, the entirety, cannot have a counterpart. It is the entirety. It is all. All is all.
>
> OBVIOUSLY.
>
> And what is ALSO OBVIOUS is that there ACTUALLY IS a 'counterpart' OF 'Existence', Itself. Which as I just POINTED OUT and SHOWED DOES EXIST.

Again, that is a conceptual counterpart of the *concept* existence, not a counterpart of existence in its entirety.

As stated, both the concept existence and the concept nonexistence are only concepts. Concepts are not the totality of existence and thus can have counterparts.

The totality of existence, which includes the concept existence and the concept nonexistence along with all other things, does not and cannot have a counterpart as it is all things. It is all existence. It is existence. The Infinite, which has no counterpart, which is not exceeded and which is unlimited.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> > And that conceptual counterpart would be, it would be part of existence, not nonexistence. Hence the contradictory concept nonexistence.
>
> BUT as long as you ACKNOWLEDGE that the EXISTENCE of the 'concept' OF 'nonexistence', which is the conceptual counterpart for the 'concept' of 'existence', IS True and thus DOES EXIST, then that was ALL that was NEEDED to be SHOWN here that **a counterpart of 'existence' does ACTUALLY EXIST**, WITHIN 'Existence', Itself, of course.

The concept nonexistence is not a counterpart of existence.

The concept nonexistence is a counterpart of the *concept* existence.

They are not the same.

Again, existence, as the entirety, generally speaking, has no counterpart. It is all things. It is all. All is all.

Existence, *the concept*, has a conceptual counterpart, nonexistence. Both of those concepts are things, they are parts of existence.

However concepts alone are not the entirety of existence. The entirety of existence is the entirety of existence and by definition has no counterpart. If existence, if all things had a counterpart then it wouldn't be all things.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> Also, WHY do you propose that just AN 'opposite' or 'opposing' word or term for another word or term is 'contradictory' AT ALL?

Nonexistence is not just an opposite or opposing word. The term nonexistence is contradictory because it contradicts itself.

The term nothing or nonexistence is contradictory because it implies no thing while it is a thing.

The term nonexistence implies no existing while there is an existing. See it? Nonexistence. Nothing. Those are things claiming not to be.

They are flimsy, contradictory terms and concepts garnering flimsy, contradictory defense.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 1:53 pm
> > > Is a 'unicorn' a 'thing'?
> > >
> > > Are 'unicorns' an aspect of 'Existence'?
> >
> > Yes, a unicorn is a thing.
> >
> > It is a word, a term, a concept, a mythological creature. An animal which may actually exist on some planet or in some other realm. After all we have similar animals here: horses.
> >
> > The word, the idea, the concept at least, is perceived. It has quality, if only conceptual.
> >
> > So yes, unicorns are aspects or parts of existence.
> >
> > A thing is a thing; every thing is some thing, not no thing.
>
> SO, 'nonexistence', the word, the idea, the concept, IS A 'thing', and THUS an aspect or a part of 'Existence', Itself. Therefore, 'nonexistence', like 'unicorns' EXIST.

Yes, they are all things.

Some thing that *is* is not nonexistence or nothing.

A concept, a word, a term are all things. Even nonexistence is a thing, not actual nonexistence, even if it tries to tell you otherwise.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Gary Childress** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:59 pm

Gary Childress
Posts: 11130
Joined: Sun Sep 25, 2011 3:08 pm
Location: It's my fault

Congrats on your proof that existence is a word. Absolutely irrefutable! We're off to a solid start!

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am
> So, you AGREE that 'nonexistence' exists, in some form and way, YET also STILL want to 'try to' CLAIM that 'nonexistence' actually does NOT exist.

No, nonexistence *does not exist*. In any form.

When I say "*nonexistence* is a thing" what I'm really saying is "*a thing* is a thing".

"Nonexistence" is not nonexistence. It is contradictory. "Nonexistence" is a word, a concept, a thing. "Nonexistence" is existence.

Nonexistence does not exist. Only existence exists.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am
> Does 'language', itself, REALLY have 'limits'?

Yes, language has limits. Language is language, it is not the totality of existence. It is limited to that extent.

Only existence is infinite.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am
> So, if 'nonexistence' and 'nonexistent' can be 'things', then WHY can 'nothing' or 'no thing' NOT be a 'thing' as well, to you?

They are: words, terms, concepts. Precisely why they *aren't* really nothing, no thing or nonexistence.

Every thing is something. All there are are things. All that is is existence.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> > If there is existence there is not nonexistence.
>
> But you just through TELLING us and CLAIMING that 'nonexistence', in some forms, IS an aspect of, or a PART OF, 'Existence', Itself.

Once more that *is not* nonexistence. I'm referring to a word, a term, a concept. That is [part of] existence. It is a word, a term, a concept. A contradictory word, term, concept.

A flimsy, contradictory, misleading word, term and concept.

Nonexistence. It's similar to writing "blue" in red.

Such incongruence helps reveal the nonsense for what it is.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> > Existence and nonexistence cannot simultaneously be. Nonexistence is not and cannot be at all.
>
> YET you just SAID that 'nonexistence' DOES ACTUALLY EXIST, as a 'word', a 'concept' AND as an 'idea'.
>
> So, THE CONTRADICTION continues.

Nonexistence *is never perceived or interacted with as it does not exist*.

As defined and stated in the original essay.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:29 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> > If there are many things there is not nothing.
>
> SO, if there are 'many things' in one PART OF the Universe, then there can NOT be 'nothing' in ANOTHER PART of the Universe, right?

Correct.

If there is something, if there are things there is not nothing. Anywhere.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:40 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:13 am
>
> > **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:11 pm
> > >
> > > The location is myself, a conscious being, which is located in Tennessee, America, Earth, Milky Way, Existence.
> >
> > Yourself / myself must be everywhere at once then, to be located in all the places you've mentioned. In reality there is no known object observing itself,
>
> BUT, IN Reality, if One 'Thing' is ABLE to SEE, COMPREHEND, KNOW, and UNDERSTAND ALL, then 'It' COULD, and MUST BE ABLE TO, SEE, or OBSERVE, 'ItSelf'.
>
> Or, to you, is the ALL-KNOWING and ALL-SEEING One NOT even ABLE TO observe ALL and Everything, or thy Self?
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> > as concepts know nothing of their existence.
>
> So, the human concept of 'Oneness' KNOWS absolutely NOTHING of the existence of thy One, thee Self, Itself, correct?
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm
> > America does not know of its existence it's an idea…and what is an idea? I've no idea.
> >
> > Nothing is everything and everything is nothing…..in this conception. . Albeit illusory.

Be careful who and what you reference. Some of those statements are not mine.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:23 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> > Something and nothing cannot coexist.
>
> Ok, lets try another way of putting this into words.
>
> Does not a blank empty screen and the moving pictures projected onto it not coexist together in conjunction with the knowing of these two concepts (empty and full) (no thing and some thing)?
>
> The empty blank screen and the projected images upon it both arise at the same time together as existence, one doesn't come first and the other follow after, they both exist as the same time, namely, here NOW
> Existence is BOTH the empty screen and the contents on it.

As expressed earlier:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm
> However both the blank screen and the image are things, they are parts of existence whether they exist simultaneously or not. In other words it is all existence. There is always existence.

Even if all these *things* coexist they are all *things*, they are all parts of existence. They are not nonexistence.

Every aspect of your premise involves things and qualities of things.

A blank, empty screen is a blank, empty screen. A thing. The moving pictures are moving pictures. Those are things. Knowing them as concepts, that they are concepts. Concepts are things. Empty is a quality or condition of some thing. Empty is a quality or property and is itself a thing. Full is a quality or condition of some thing. Full is a quality or property and is itself a thing.

All referenced are things, are [parts of] existence. Nonexistence is not referenced or alluded to in any way. It can't be. *Nonexistence does not exist*.

You are attempting to use examples of things to create an analogy to identify nonexistence. It does not and will not work. You only have things to work with as there are only things. You cannot effectively reference or metaphor nonexistence as there is only existence.

As you concede, existence is both the empty screen and the contents on it.

Existence is all. There is only existence.

There is no place for nothingness as existence is infinite. Nothingness is not and cannot be.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Wed Jul 05, 2023 1:20 pm

Age ONLINE
Posts: 26381
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> > >
> > > It's apparent in the density variance of things. Air is less dense than quartz.
> >
> > But 'air' is a 'material thing', right?
>
> Air is comprised of physical material, yes. But air is also comprised of immaterial expanse.

Can you NAME a 'thing', which is NOT comprised of 'immaterial expanse'?

If yes, then WILL you?

If no, then WHY NOT?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
> Air is not as dense, air contains less matter than stone or other objects which contain more matter and less immaterial expanse.

It is ALSO said that some people are LESS dense than "others" are, and, that some people are MORE dense than "others" are, AS WELL.

But, just like what you SAID and WROTE here, so what?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> > > Different objects, different regions of existence exhibit various densities due to various amounts of immaterial expanse.
> >
> > But 'objects' and 'regions of existence' are 'material things', right?
>
> Certain things are considered material things, yes. Those things are largely comprised of matter or of physical material and are tangible or palpable.

What do you mean by 'largely comprised of matter or of physical material'?

Could you name just ONE 'material thing', which is NOT comprised of 'matter' NOR of 'physical material'?

'you', ONCE AGAIN, are seemingly MISSING or MISUNDERSTANDING the WHOLE POINT here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> > And, 'to have density' would be a 'material thing' right? Or, can 'immaterial expanse' have 'density' also?
>
> Any object or region can be considered to have density.
>
> Again it concerns the amount of physical material present, the amount of energy present and the amount of immaterial expanse present. Those things, including immaterial expanse, are components which determine density. That is density, that is what determines density variance. For any object, for any region.
>
> Theoretically speaking perhaps a 100% completely solid, completely material object would have 100% density while a region of completely pure immaterial expanse would have 0% density.

And, for a region of 'immaterial expanse', which would OBVIOUSLY HAVE TO IRREFUTABLY BE 'completely pure' anyway, so these two words here are redundant, but anyway, for ANY and ALL regions of 'immaterial expanse', they would have zero density BECAUSE of 'what reason', EXACTLY?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> > So, WHERE is the 'immaterial expanse', EXACTLY?
>
> All around. Immaterial expanse is quite prevalent. Not ubiquitous but prevalent.
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am
> > >
> > > Yes, concepts may have counterparts as they are parts of existence, concepts alone are not the entirety of existence.
> >
> > Great. So, the 'counterpart' of 'Existence', which is 'nonexistence', is a 'concept', which ACTUALLY does exist, IN 'Existence'.
>
> The counterpart of the *concept* existence.
>
> Yes. The concept, the term "nonexistence" is a concept. It exists.

GREAT. So you AGREE.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
> That would not be nonexistence or no thing.

OF COURSE A 'thing' could NOT be 'no thing'. This goes WITHOUT SAYING, NOR even having to be EXPLAINED.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm
> That is a term, a concept. A thing. Not no thing.